

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

PIMENIO VELA HERRERA,	)	8:12CV321
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
	)	<b>AND ORDER</b>
TAMMY MOWRY, MONTE	)	
HOVIC, JESSE ROBINS, HAHN,	)	
STEPHENS, and JEREMY	)	
BRUNGARD,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court on its own motion. Plaintiff had until June 6, 2013, to complete service of process in this matter. (*See* Filing No. [13](#) at CM/ECF pp. 2-3 (granting 120 days from the date of the court’s February 12, 2013, Memorandum and Order to complete service of process). To date, five of the six named defendants have answered Plaintiff’s Complaint. (*See* Filing Nos. [25](#) and [28](#).) However, Plaintiff’s attempts to serve Defendant Jesse Robins have been unsuccessful. Summons forms were returned unexecuted on April 8, 2013, and June 14, 2013, because, in both instances, Defendant Jesse Robins did not work or reside at the address provided by Plaintiff. (*See* Filing Nos. [21](#) and [30](#).)

It is Plaintiff’s duty to determine Defendant Jesse Robin’s whereabouts, not the duty of the marshals service or the clerk’s office. *See* [Gray v. Rose, 2009 WL 2132623 at \\*3 \(S.D. Ohio 2009\)](#) (“The fact that this defendant could not be effectively served with process at that address is chargeable to plaintiff, not to either the Clerk or the Marshal.”); *see also* [Gustaff v. MT Ultimate Healthcare, 2007 WL 2028103 at \\*3 \(E.D.N.Y. 2007\)](#) (“The United States Marshals Service cannot investigate defendant’s whereabouts, nor can the court. That is Plaintiff’s responsibility.”)

A court must extend the time for service if a plaintiff shows there was “good cause” for the failure to serve within 120 days. *Id.*; [\*Adams v. AlliedSignal Gen. Aviation Avionics\*, 74 F.3d 882, 887 \(8th Cir. 1996\)](#). Accordingly, on the court’s own motion, the court will give Plaintiff 30 days from the date of this Memorandum and Order to show cause why Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant Jesse Robins should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to serve him within 120 days.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff shall have 30 days from the date of this Memorandum and Order to show cause why Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant Jesse Robins should not be dismissed. If Plaintiff does not respond, or if good cause is not shown, this action will proceed only as to Plaintiff’s claims against the other five defendants.

2. The clerk’s office is directed to set a pro se case management deadline with the following text: July 29, 2013: deadline for Plaintiff to show cause why service of process was not completed on Jesse Robins.

DATED this 28th day of June, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon  
United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.